

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/010,742	DILLON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Teresa E. Strzelecka	1637

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Teresa E. Strzelecka. (3) _____.

(2) Julie Urvater. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 January 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. 101, utility and 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enablement

Claims discussed:

1, 3, 4

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Teresa Strzelecka
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Ms. Urvater was contacted to notify Applicants that Michael Woodward considered their arguments regarding utility persuasive and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enablement, should be withdrawn. Examiner agreed to an addition of composition claims..